

REMARKS

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,991,646 (“Frank”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and notes that in order to sustain a claim rejection under § 102, each of the claimed elements must be found, either expressly or inherently, in the cited reference.

Claim 1 recites a region of a microphone *having a lowest sensitivity*, wherein the region is *aimed at a speaker when a microphone boom is located in either said first position or said second position* (Emphasis Added). Frank does not disclose or suggest such limitations. Rather, Frank discloses a microphone arm 102 that is rotatably coupled to a casing 108 (column 3, lines 18-20). According to the Office Action, figure 5 of Frank allegedly discloses the above limitations. However, the cited passage of Frank does not disclose or suggest a microphone region *having a lowest sensitivity*, much less, a microphone region having a lowest sensitivity *that is aimed at a speaker when a microphone boom is located in either a first or a second position*. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection for claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Frank in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0063456 (“Griffin”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 3 and 22 recite a *unidirectional* microphone (Emphasis Added). Frank and Griffin do not disclose or suggest such limitation. According to the Office Action, column 1, lines 32-33 of Frank allegedly discloses an “unidirectional microphone.” However, the cited passage merely discloses a microphone that is “sensitive,” and therefore, does not disclose or suggest an unidirectional microphone. Notably, the sensitivity of a microphone is independent of, and has nothing to do with, whether the microphone is unidirectional or not (i.e., a particular microphone may or may not be sensitive, regardless of whether it is unidirectional). Griffin also does not disclose a unidirectional microphone, and therefore, fails to make up the deficiency present in Frank. For at least the foregoing reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection for claims 3 and 22, and their respective dependent claims, be withdrawn.


Claim 3 also recites a region of a microphone having a lowest sensitivity is aimed at a speaker when a microphone boom is located in any of said plurality of positions. Claim 22 recites similar limitations. As similarly discussed with reference to claim 1, Frank does not disclose or suggest such limitations. Griffin also does not disclose or suggest the above limitations, and therefore, fails to make up the deficiencies present in Frank. Since neither Frank nor Griffin discloses or suggests the above limitations, they cannot be combined to form the resulting subject matter of claims 3 and 22. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection for claims 3 and 22, and their respective dependent claims, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

DATE: February 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Gerald Chan
Registration No. 51,541

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4960
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800